CALL TO ORDER
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Richard Folse, Jr., Carmine Frangella, Ryant Price, Marilyn Ross, Webb Jay, Randy Petit
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Jack Keen
ALSO PRESENT:	Michael Albert, Chris Welker, Brett Badgerow, Zoe Vittur, Donya Hebert and Toriel Flot of the Planning Department.

2024-11-HOP requested by Victoria Bourg for a home occupation – "Victoria M. Bourg, CPA, LLC" an accounting service– at 411 Honeysuckle Drive, Norco. Council District 6.

Ms. Vittur– read the staff report, and the department recommends approval.

The public hearing was opened and closed, no one spoke for or against.

Commissioner Ross made a motion to approve, second by Price.

YEAS: PRICE, FRANGELLA, FOLSE, PETIT, ROSS, JAY
NAYS: NONE
ABSENT: KEEN
PASSED

2024-12-HOP requested by Zachary Falgout for a home occupation – "DuckDown Charters" a hunting and fishing guide service – at 210 Mimosa Avenue, Luling. Council District 7.

Ms. Vittur– read the staff report, and the department recommends approval.

Applicant – Zachary Falgout 210 Mimosa Ave. Luling, stated his case.

The public hearing was opened and closed, no one spoke for or against.

Commissioner Folse made a motion to approve, second by Price.

YEAS: PRICE, FRANGELLA, FOLSE, PETIT, ROSS, JAY
NAYS: NONE
ABSENT: KEEN
PASSED

2024-13-HOP requested by Tawanda Thomas for a home occupation – "Heart Arrangements Floral Designs, LLC" – at 579 Cypress Drive, Luling. Council District 2.

Mr. Badgerow– read the staff report, and the department recommends approval.

The public hearing was opened and closed, no one spoke for or against.

Commissioner Price made a motion to approve, second by Folse.

YEAS: PRICE, FRANGELLA, FOLSE, PETIT, ROSS, JAY
NAYS: NONE
ABSENT: KEEN
PASSED

2024-18-MIN requested by Andrew Lemmon for Simoneaux Family Land, LLC for a resubdivision of undivided land into two lots, 3945 and 4381 Bayou Gauche Road, Bayou Gauche. Zoning Districts R-1A(M) and W. Council District 4.

Mr. Badgerow– read the staff report, and the department recommends approval with the waivers.

The public hearing was open and closed, no one spoke for or against.

Commissioner Frangella made a motion to approve with waiver, seconded by Commissioner Ross.

YEAS: PRICE, FRANGELLA, FOLSE, PETIT, ROSS, JAY
NAYS: NONE
ABSENT: KEEN
PASSED

2024-20-MIN requested by Lynnette Richards for a resubdivision of one lot into two, 106 Early Street, Paradis. Zoning District R-1A(M). Council District 4.

Mr. Badgerow– read the staff report, and the department recommends approval.

The public hearing was opened and closed, no one spoke for or against.

Commissioner Folse made a motion to approve, second by Price.

YEAS: PRICE, FRANGELLA, FOLSE, PETIT, ROSS, JAY
NAYS: NONE
ABSENT: KEEN
PASSED

2024-21-MIN requested by Denver Perilloux et als. for a resubdivision of three lots into five, 17956 and 17962 River Road, Montz. Zoning Districts B-2, R-1A(M) and O-L. Council District 6.

Mr. Badgerow– read the staff report, and the department recommends approval.

Applicant – Denver Perilloux – 17956 River Road, stated his case.

The public hearing was open.

Melanie Schexnayder 155 Thoroughbred Ave. Montz

David Bleakley 436 Oak St. Norco

Marcia Culver 163 Thorroughbred Ave. Montz

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Ross made a motion to approve, second by Frangella.

YEAS: PRICE, FRANGELLA, FOLSE, PETIT, ROSS, JAY
NAYS: NONE
ABSENT: KEEN
PASSED

2024-21-R requested by Danny Alexander for a change of zoning from R-1A(M) to R-2 on Lots 35 and 36, Oak Ridge Park Subdivision, 925 and 935 Paul Fredrick Drive, Luling. Council District 1.

Mr. Welker – this is a rezoning which must meet two of the three rezoning criteria in order to get a recommendation of approval from the department. The department does recommend approval for the request finding that it meets the first and third rezoning criteria. To summarize those items and how they are met, the first guideline or criteria is whether the rezoning conforms to the land development pattern established by the comprehensive plan future land use map and does not create a spot zoning as incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The future land use map designates this site as town center the idea behind that designation is that mix use development focused around employment uses to accomplish that type of development pattern that future land use designation has a wide range of zoning districts that can be considered under it's umbrella one of those is the requested R2 zoning district along with R3 multi family and the various commercial districts. This particular town center area is also note worthy because it's around St. Charles Parish Hospital site fulfilling the idea its around employment center, it's also in alignment with the Paul Mallard Road revitalization overlay district so this request of R2 fits not just in alignment with the comprehensive plan future land use map it also works toward accomplishing goals and ideas we put forth during the Paul Mallard Road revitalization plan. This does meet the parishes definition of a spot zone the request of R2 does not extend special privileges to these lots that aren't available to others in the area is mostly focused on Paul Mallard Road where the zoning the use restrictions are much lifted for residential and commercial uses there is standard zoning but the overlay district allows for multi-family, duplexes, single family homes, commercial and basically any lot along the corridor so right next door you can have duplexes on Paul Mallard Road. There was also earlier last year 2024-2-R approved a similar rezoning I think it was 5 lots to R2 down Paul Frederick so there is similar zoning and development within in the area, so we don't consider it spot zone and most importantly it's in (inaudible) comprehensive plan. How it meets the third criteria, despite being an upzoning permitting housing at a higher density so going from a single family to a two family, the R2 district the development standards are more in line with the R1A district that can be found in the surrounding area and the site built single family homes that can be found in the surrounding area R2 district requires the same site built construction same minimum lot area and width, same set back requirements, and same rear yard coverage. The current R-1A district actually permits smaller setbacks, non-site-built construction, etc. So, the more stringent development requirements while still allowing for an extra family to be on one lot it's more in line with some of the single family homes you'll find along Paul Frederick and the surrounding area so we don't there will be too much of a deviation from neighborhood character and while there would be an increase in the amount of units from 2 to 4 it's not that substantial of an increase to have any detriment to the public facilities in the area so we find the third criteria is met in that regard and like I said we recommend approval based on meeting the first and third criteria.

The public hearing was open and closed, no one spoke for or against.

Commissioner Price made a motion to approve, seconded by Commissioner Frangella.

YEA: Price, Frangella, Petit, Folse, Jay, Ross
NAY: None
ABSENT: Keen

PASSED

2024-22-R requested by Pether Alonso for a change of zoning from R-1A to M-1 on Lot 127X, Coteau de France, 16076 Hwy 631, Paradis. Council District 4.

Mr. Welker – Mr. Welker – yes in this rezoning case the department recommends denial, we found that neither of the three rezoning criteria were met. To go over how each of those items were not met criteria one whether the land development pattern established by the comprehensive plan future land use map is met and does not create a spot zoning lot 127X is designated rural residential that's geared towards large lots, residential sites and agricultural uses the type of development permitted under the requested M1 zoning does not fit that designation and M1 is not considered under a recommended zoning district under that designation. M1 zoning is present in the area adjacent to the north and south subject site extending down LA 631 so while this request does not have the appearance of an out right spot zone it does not meet this guideline due to not being in further to the comprehensive plan. Whether or not on the second criteria, whether or not the land use pattern or character has changed to the extent that the existing zoning no longer allows reasonable use lot 127X and all the surrounding area was originally zoned M1. This started changing in 2006 with the first rezone from M1 to R1A another 2 rezonings from M1 to R1A followed one in 2008 and another in 2009 effecting the subject site itself after the 2009 rezoning the only remaining M1 district north of LA 635 was over the property used as an historic cemetery subsequent develop followed with the north side of LA 635 now lined with site built single family homes marking a substantial shift in the land use pattern and character in this area. The current zoning over lot 127X permits development in line with what's been established here over the past 18 years, and it can be further resubdivided with space up to three development sites. The current zoning allows for more than reasonable use and reverting back to M1 would go against the shift detailed above. On the third criteria whether or not the potential use is permitted by the proposed rezoning would be incompatible with the existing neighborhood character or overburden public facilities. The neighborhood character is that of a residential community in relatively secluded rural setting a result of the three separate rezonings from M1 to R1A detailed in the previous section. M1 zoning exist adjacent to the residential uses along LA 635 however no industrial development has occurred on these parcels which remain heavily wooded. The M1 zone parcel north of the subject site is an existing cemetery and is not an industrial use. Reverting the subject back to M1 would potentially establish incompatible uses along the residential neighborhood border. So, it doesn't meet that criteria and for not meeting any of the criteria the department recommends denial.

Brian Alonso representing Pether Alonso, just translating. We rezoning to M1 because this property was previously rezoned as M1, we have no real industrial um I guess future plans for it our plan is to just put a warehouse for just like equipment and material storage. Like he said the adjacent properties are M1 so I think this would be an easy rezoning it's not a spot zone. We don't think it's a good spot for R1A because the back is a railroad, the left is a cemetery and the right is wetlands so I don't think this is a good place to put houses on. The adjacent street which is like the street that goes down to Airline um yes Airline Hwy. (inaudible) those have streets but they aren't wetlands and there's no like cemetery to the adjacent property so we think it would just be better for M1 we are just going to put a warehouse it's not really an industrial like super commercial we just putting a warehouse on there just to store material that was our idea and were having a problem with wetlands right now so we don't know if they will except it for as residential use we talked about putting warehouses on the property and they said they were fine with it and so that's why we want to change it back to M1.

The public hearing was open.

Bertha Barfield 122 Hwy. 635 Des Allemands and I wish to state my opposition to this zoning change. My property lies adjacent to the proposed zoning change and I'm concerne that such a change may negatively impact the value of my property as well as the other residents on that street. The neighborhood is developed as a residential property and to change it to M1it threatens to alter the nature and I think um of the development and consequently I'm here to register my opposition.

Donald Moyer 104 Hwy. 635 – I live at the end of that street where they want to do that construction at the end, I live on the 90 side. It's residential we have kids playing right there 3 little boys on the side of me and it's been residential since I moved there and before I built and

to bring in a warehouse of any sort along there I think would impact the type of community we have there and the wetlands there isn't any industry right there even though the one across the street is zoned M1 nothing, it's heavily wooded like the gentleman said right there. So I just want to say I'm against it.

Sara Sims Touchard 15305 Hwy. 90 Paradis, LA – I 'am opposed to the change of residential to M1. I own property across 631 which is also residential, and it will soon be up for sale and I certainly feel that any change would effect the price of that property. It's beautiful land, it's historic land his property is adjacent to a historical mound where native American and early settlers of St. Charles Parish were buried and I think that would impact the beauty of the area.

Mitchell Bolden Jr. 143 S. Kinler St. Boutte, LA also the Pastor at Antioch Baptist Church we own that cemetery and property right adjacent to that. My main concern is what they plan on putting in there that's my main concern and I don't know what can be put in that type zoning. Commissioner Petit – so in M1 it could be, it could be anything once it's rezoned for towing, barrooms, night clubs and lounges and dance halls upon review of the planning commission, any type of warehouse, automobile lots, it's a long list that would be in the advertisement.

Mr. Bolden – well let it stay like it is not going to hurt those people in that cemetery they sleeping, but the other residents right there, yall have a good day.

Commissioner Petit – thank you.

Commissioner Ross made a motion to approve, seconded by Commissioner Price.

YEA: NONE
NAY: PRICE, FRANGELLA, PETIT, JAY, FOLSE, ROSS
ABSENT: KEEN
FAILED

2024-23-R requested by Bruce Pitre and Robin Rogers for a change of zoning from C-1 to R-1A(M) on a Portion of Lot 1, P.R. Vicknair Property, 167 Post Street, Killona. Council District 1.

Mr. Welker – yea regarding this rezoning the department recommends approval due to finding it meets two of the three zoning criteria's specifically the first and the third. To go over how those are met whether or not it meets the future land use map designation and can be considered a spot zone this portion of lot one is an area designated high density residential that anticipates various mostly detached, mostly attached residential uses. However, it does call for small lot detached houses and now the R1AM zoning district isn't explicitly recommended under this future land use designation but the R1AM zoning district does allow for the smallest lot area for a detached single-family home so we find it does fall within the description of a small lot attached houses an falls under this designation an meets this criteria. It's also not a spot zone at all due to it being in the middle of a large established R1AM district. The third criteria that's met whether or not the potential use it permitted by the proposed rezoning or compatible with the existing neighborhood character the R1AM zoning encompasses most of Killona including immediately adjacent to the site or pretty much surrounding the subject site the development in the area reflect the zoning with a mix of site built and manufactured homes including adjacent to both sides. So, the single-family homes whether site built or manufactured would be compatible with the surrounding area and what's permitted immediately or around immediately adjacent to the site. As far as the burdening utilities the site had been used historically as a commercial, I think it was a post office of some sort at one point in time making it developable for a single-family residence wouldn't have an impact on the utilities in this developed area. So, for meeting the first and third guideline the department recommends approval.

The public hearing was open and closed, no one spoke for or against.

Commissioner Frangella made a motion to approve, seconded by Commissioner Ross.

YEAS: FRANGELLA, PRICE, PETIT, JAY, FOLSE, ROSS
NAYS: NONE
ABSENT: KEEN
PASSED

2024-24-R requested by Malcolm Darensbourg, III for M.A.D. III, LLC for a change of zoning from C-2 to C-3 on Lot 25A, Good Hope Subdivision Annex "C", 196 Good Hope Street, Norco. Council District 6.

Mr. Welker – yea the department recommends denial of this request due to the finding it does not meet any of the three rezoning guidelines. To summarize how each of those guidelines are not met whether it conforms to the future land use map or creates a spot zone the site is in an area designated neighborhood mix use which anticipates development a variety of residential uses along with compatible local serving commercial retail office and service uses. The intensity of the commercial uses that are permitted under the C-3 district includes, wholesale, warehousing, some manufacturing and fabrication various trades, it does not fit with the more neighborhood scale local serving commercial uses anticipated under the neighborhood mix use designation while there is an argument for this not being considered a spot zone due to the presence of C3 zoning at the opposite intersection of Goodhope and Third along with the concentration of C3 zoning 2 to 3 blocks over on Apple and Barreca it must demonstrate further (inaudible) comprehensive plan in order for this guideline to be met, because it does not criteria one is not met. The subject site has been as far as whether the land use pattern or character has changed to the extent that the existing zoning allows for reasonable use the subject site has been under commercial zoning since at least 1981 the neighborhood character land use pattern is defines by older site built houses, manufactured homes, and some commercial uses, the current use of the subject site is a permitted automobile service station under the existing C-2 zoning. The C-2 zoning district allows for a variety of commercial uses that would fit within this commercial nodes such as retail sales, offices and restaurants, anything that can be considered local serving. The C-2 zoning because of how much it actually permits and that it allows what is currently operating out of this location we do find it does a lot for reasonable use of the subject site. On criteria three whether or not potential use is permitted by the proposed rezoning will be incompatible with the existing neighborhood character or overburden public facilities. The existing neighborhood character is that of a commercial node around the intersection of Goodhope St. and Third St. and developed residential neighborhoods with homes fronting primarily on Goodhope and St. Charles St. each corner of the above the intersection is developed with commercial buildings historically occupied with variety of commercial uses that once included the St. Charles Parish library Norco branch which has now moved further down Apple and now it's just a commercial building that's available for C-2 use 1001 Third St. was developed as a credit union occupancy was most recently issue for and rv parts store and office and there is other kind of more institutional or infrastructure uses such as a large cell tower directly behind it. Several uses permitted in a C-3 district would be incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood despite commercial nature of the intersection C-3 zoning and uses which include as previously mentioned whole sales, warehousing, manufacturing and fabrication of various trades are not compatible with the residential neighborhood and commercial character of the area basically the idea C-3 is almost nearly an industrial zoning district basically further intrusion of that type of use within what is ultimately a very strongly residential area with more small scale commercial it just doesn't have the same compatibility. So, the request does not meet the third guideline and as mentioned due to not meeting any of the three criteria the department recommends denial.

Applicant – Malcolm Darensbourg 318 Devon Road LaPlace, LA I initially asked for a rezoning because I want to be able to get a dealer license to be able to purchase and sell a few cars out of my service station for extra income if I cant get it rezoned I just want to be able to do that and I was told that I have to get it rezoned but I'm also understanding I can get something called a um I think it's called a special use permit but I also understand a rezoning was done from a R1 to a C3 recently not to long ago in the same neighborhood. On that particular street Shell Chemical is behind the building, they have an empty lot which AT & T owns a tower nothing is there I own the property across the street that use to be a library, next to that to the

right is a train track and across the track is an RV parts store which it makes it looks like an rv mechanic shop because they have a lot of rv's over there, across there is another big warehouse that area does more look like and around my area is more of industrial area but like I said I just want to be able to purchase and sell cars that's the only reason why I want to do a C3, don't want a warehouse, don't want anything such. So I'm just asking to see if it can be granted.

Commissioner Petit- and Chris to clarify we can so a special permit use can be requested for automobile sales in C2.

Mr. Welker – trying to remember correctly I think the issue and one of the reasons why the C3 is necessary is because the special permit in C2 you can do automobiles sales and service as a special permit but only when you're fronting on a state road. So with not being a state road that option kinda falls away prompting the only route is a rezone.

Mr. Darensbourg – also in the pass they use to have a car dealership on Goodhope St. So I just want to state that.

The public hearing was open and closed after no one spoke for or against.

Commissioner Frangella made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ross.

YEAS: PRICE
NAYS: FRANGELLA, PETIT, FOLSE, JAY, ROSS
ABSENT: KEEN
FAILED

Unfinished/Old Business-
New Business-Welcome Mr. Webb Jay to Commission.
Minutes-
Adjourn